EX. E

> Thanks.

```
Subject: Re:
Date: Wednesday, August 8, 2007 8:06 PM
From: Snyder, Orin <OSnyder@gibsondunn.com>
To: <c.serbagi@earthlink.net>
Cc: "\"Arato, Cynthia S.\"" <CArato@gibsondunn.com>, "\"Craven, Michelle M.\"" <MCraven@gibsondunn.com>
Thank you. Have a nice night.
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Device
----Original Message----
From: Christopher Serbagi <c.serbagi@earthlink.net>
To: Snyder, Orin
CC: Arato, Cynthia S.; Craven, Michelle M.
Sent: Wed Aug 08 19:19:01 2007
Subject: Re:
On the basis of this representation and your consistent representation to
on the phone just now, Plaintiffs will consent to the additional day.
have agreed not to view our Amended Complaint until you file. Please pass
that on to CMG counsel as well.
On 8/8/07 7:09 PM, "Snyder, Orin" <OSnyder@gibsondunn.com> wrote:
> OK?
>
> (Note: we are not asserting any new claims; we are cutting claims and
> allegations)
>
>
> From: Snyder, Orin
> Sent: Wed 8/8/2007 6:25 PM
> To: Christopher Serbagi
> Cc: Arato, Cynthia S.; Craven, Michelle M.
> Subject: RE:
>
>
> Cynthia's nanny is in the hospital, hospitalized last night.
> Cynthia has been out-of-pocket all day, with kids at home.
> Michelle was delayed getting into the office due to train problems.
> As result, we could not turn around the draft to get to client for
approval.
> Please confirm that we can have the extra day. We will not look at your
> pleading; you have my word.
```

EX. F

```
07cqshaMS.txt
                                                                              1
      07cqshaMS
 1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      SHAW FAMILY ARCHIVES, LTD.,
 3
      et al.,
 4
 4
5
6
                        Plaintiffs.
                                                    05 Civ. 3939(KMK)(MDF)
                   ٧.
 6
      CMG WORLDWIDE, INC., ET AL.,
 7
7
8
8
                        Defendants.
 9
9
                                                    White Plains, N.Y.
10
                                                    December 26, 2007
10
11
      Before:
11
12
12
13
13
                            THE HONORABLE MARK D. FOX,
                                                Magistrate Judge
14
                                    APPEARANCES
14
15
15
16
      LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTOPHER SERBAGI
            Attorneys for Plaintiffs
      CHRISTOPHER SERBAGI
16
17
17
18
18
19
19
      LOEB & LOEB
            Attorneys for Defendant Marilyn Monroe, LLC
      BARRY I. SLOTNICK
      JONATHAN STRAUSS
20
      SOVICH, MINCH
            Attorneys for Defendant CMG Worldwide, Inc.
21
22
22
      CHRISTINE SOVICH (via telephone)
23
24
24
      Proceedings recorded by
25
      electronic sound recording.
                          MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                               2
```

07cqshaMS

1 2 3

8

THE DEPUTY CLERK: This is the matter of Shaw Family against CMG Worldwide, et al.

Counsel, please state your names for the record.
MR. SLOTNICK: Barry Slotnick for MM, LLC.
MS. SOVICH: Christine Sovich -THE COURT: Just a moment, please.

Go ahead.

MR. SLOTNICK: Barry Slotnick for MM, LLC, along with Jonathan Strauss.

Page 1

```
07cqshams.txt
10
                       MR. SERBAGI: Good morning, your Honor.
11
                       Christopher Serbagi for Shaw Family Archives.
12
                       THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
13
                       (Pause)
14
                       THE COURT: Okay. Now, somebody is on the phone
15
         representing or on behalf of Mr. Minch, I believe.
16
17
                       Is that right?
         MS. SOVICH: Yes, that is correct.

THE COURT: All right. You'll be permitted to listen in, but you can't argue. I don't take argument over the phone.

All right. Now, I have before me a whole series of
18
19
20
21
22
23
         letter briefs, and the record should reflect each -
         Mr. Serbagi, I guess, handed me about an inch and a half of paper, or handed it to my Clerk, about ten minutes ago, which I have not read. I've read the letters, but not the attachments.
                       The discovery cutoff on this case is December 31st.
                                   MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                           3
         07cqshaMS
 1
2
3
4
                       The issue that is before the Court --
         And I say that, Mr. Serbagi, so that if there is anything in those attachments that you think is relevant, you
         can mention it in your argument.

All right. The issue before the Court started in
 5
 67
         Ms. Colbath's December 7th letter. And then there was a
         December 10th letter from Mr. Serbagi. And then there was a December 20th letter from Mr. Strauss. And then there were the
 .
8
9
         two letters delivered this morning from Mr. Serbagi.

So, Mr. Slotnick, you can let me know what your position is. I'll take oral argument, and then I'm prepared to
10
11
12
         make a ruling on this.
Go ahead, please.
13
                       MR. SLOTNICK: Thank you, your Honor.
Before we get to the "he said she said" about whose
14
15
         deposition should be taken when, I think we really need to talk more about more basic issue in this case.

There has been a characterization of our third amended
16
17
18
19
         complaint as being restricted to certain photographs, the
20
         Risoli book and the Ballantine book.
21
22
                       The Risoli book has already been declared by the --
                       THE COURT: You pointed that out in your letter.
MR. SLOTNICK: Okay. Absent a showing of ownership of
23
24
         some copyright interest in a photograph of Marilyn Monroe by
         the Shaw Family, they have no standing to seek any ruling with
25
                                   MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                           4
         07cqshaMS
         respect to Marilyn Monroe's domicile.
                The only -- the issue in this case from the beginning Who has the rights to utilize Marilyn Monroe's name and
  2
3
 4
5
6
7
         likeness?
                       Judge McMahon has ruled in a way that we respectfully,
         you know, aren't happy with, of course, that there was no right of publicity in Marilyn Monroe that MM, LLC currently has,
 .
8
9
         subject to a determination of domicile.
         The only basis for the Shaw Family to be able to engage in the Marilyn Monroe business is owning copyrights in
```

1ŏ 11 12

13 14

0

photographs that Mr. Shaw took. They are unwilling, and have refused so far, to

identify one single photograph in the Marilyn Monroe collection that they actually own. And if they don't own that, they have Page 2

```
07cqshaMS.txt
15
         no basis for challenging our right of publicity.
16
         So, you know, this more Seinfeldian that Morovian. This may well be a case about nothing.
17
        Absent a showing that they own something -- and that's what we've been asking for -- they have no standing to challenge our right to Marilyn Monroe's right of publicity.
18
19
20
21
22
23
         And that's what the case is about, your Honor.
                        MR. SERBAGI: Good morning, your Honor
         Your Honor, as an initial matter, that's the very first time they put forth that argument to the Court or to me. It's not in any of the papers.

MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR

(914) 390-4027
24
25
                                                                                                                5
         07cqshaMS
         All the other arguments are on the papers, your Honor. And since Mr. Slotnick didn't address them, I'll just address
 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
         the point that he raised.
         The standing issue is very simple. As Judge McMahon has acknowledged, on the defendants' counsel's behalf,
         California has recently passed a statute which purports to provide a retroactive right of publicity on Marilyn Monroe.
         The defendants are also arguing that Marilyn Monroe was a California domiciliary, which, according to their position, would put that statute front and center in this case and potentially hold our clients liable under that statute.
11
12
                        That's the standing issue, your Honor. They've
         claimed a violation of the right to publicity. If the
13
14
15
16
17
         California statute is valid, as they say it is, then that's the
         standard.
                        THE COURT: It's before me right now. What's before
         me right now, according to these letters, would be governed by the scope of the pleading, one side claiming that it's limited to the Ballantine and Risoli books, the other side claiming that it's particular photographs.
18
19
20
21
22
23
                        So why doesn't somebody show me the pleading and show
         me where you think it goes your way. I have a copy of the third amended complaint in front of me.

MR. SERBAGI: Your Honor, I'll address that, since I'm
24
25
         already standing.
                                     MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
                                                  (914) 390-4027
                                                                                                                 6
         07cqshams
 1
                        THE COURT: All right.
 3
                        MR. SERBAGI: With the Court's permission, if you look
          at the third amended complaint -- I'm pulling that out, your
         Honor -- there is absolutely nothing in this third amended complaint. This is a pure fishing expedition. They don't
 456789
          request that -- they don't ask --
         THE COURT: I don't care whether it's a fishing expedition or not. The question is whether they pled it.
                        MR. SERBAGI: No, they didn't.
THE COURT: That's what I'm asking.
10
11
                        MR. SERBAGI: All they pled -- excuse me, your Honor.
12
13
          I'm sorry.
         All they pled in the complaint is that the Risoli and Ballantine books are in the public domain.
14
15
                        If the Court turns to Paragraph 23 on Page 5, that's
16
17
         where they identify that the Risoli book is in the public
```

0

domain.

(Pause)

18

19

Page 3

THE COURT: Just one moment.

0

14 15 16

17

18

24

```
07cqshams.txt
                                  THE COURT: All right.
21
                                  MR. SERBAGI: And then on Paragraph 25 -- excuse me.
22
             That's not it.
23
                                  THE COURT: 25 mentions the Ballantine book.
24
                                  MR. SERBAGI: Yes, 25. Those are the only two
             paragraphs where they request -- where they identify any book MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR (914) 390-4027
25
                                                                                                                                                                7
             07cgshams
 1
             that's in the public domain.
                                  If the Court turns to the prayer for relief, which is
            where they ask the Court to declare that a particular work is in the public domain, on Page 8, all they identify is the Risoli book as being in the public domain.

THE COURT: They say -- the prayer for relieve reads under A for declaratory judgment that "In addition to the Risoli works, defendants do not possess a valid -- do not possess valid and enforceable copyrights in those photographs
  3
 4
5
6
7
 8
  9
            that compromise the Monroe/Shaw photographs and/or the Shaw collection that were either published prior to January 1, 1964, where no copyright renewals were obtained during the final year of the initial 28-year copyright term for such photographs; or B. published prior to March 1, 1989, without the requisite copyright notice."
10
11
12
13
14
15
             MR. SERBAGI: That's correct, but all they identify in there is one book. If that argument were a bridge to get -- if that argument were acceptable to look at our entire collection,
16
17
18
             there would be no end to the discovery, your Honor. They'd be able to analyze every one of our books and every one of our
19
20
21
22
             photographs. There is no basis for that. All they've -- all
             they're asking the Court to declare is that the particular Risoli and Ballantine is in the public domain. They have
             basis to say anything else is in the public domain. They have no THE COURT: That's not what it says. It says "in MARY M. STATEN CSP PRO THE
23
24
25
                                                    MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                                                                                8
              07cqshams
  1
              addition to the Risoli works."
  2
             MR. SERBAGI: I know that it says that, your Honor, but they're not entitled to view our entire collection, just because they say "in addition." That's just language so that
  3
  4
5
             they can get to everything. You know --
THE COURT: Okay. I understand your position.
Go ahead, please.
  67
            MR. SLOTNICK: Your Honor, this is a bit of a shell game. They say we're not entitled to ask about any other photographs, but they haven't identified any other photographs, so we don't know what they are. We asked specifically, even with respect to those photographs, whether the photographs in the book had been as in two books, had even been published.
  8
  9
10
11
12
13
```

the book had been -- in two books, had ever been published before, had ever been registered before. And the witnesses --the witness will not answer questions regarding even those photographs. But that -

THE COURT: Let me just say this to everybody before we go any further.

Under the Southern District rules, directing a witness not to answer is sanctionable conduct, unless it falls within one of the exceptions in Rule 30. If it happens again, there will be sanctions. That's point one.

Point two is, I'm going to hear what everybody has to say on this, and then I'm going to make rulings. And any Page 4

07cqshams.txt discovery that I order is going to take place today, tomorrow MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR (914) 390-4027 25

07cqshaMS and Friday. December 31st is the cutoff. Judge McMahon has

made clear she's not extending it.

So go ahead, please.

MR. SLOTNICK: Your Honor, what we want to see are the copyright registrations and the other documents that we've requested regarding the Marilyn Monroe collection. The one piece of information that we did get out of Shaw's 30(b)(6) was that there may be two binders of registrations dealing with the Marilyn Monroe photographs. While that is not insignificant, it's certainly not voluminous. If those documents are produced to us today, we're prepared to take a deposition tomorrow or Friday.

THE COURT: Mr. Serbagi, let me ask you. Any attempt to narrow down the complaint is -- any opportunity to do that is long gone. I'm dealing with the pleadings as they now exist.

What specific photographs are your clients claiming that they have an interest in? Because that's what we're -- that's what this is going to be narrowed down to. So counsel says there's a folder of photographs. You haven't indicated to me what photographs. Certainly, the pleadings go beyond the Risoli and the Ballantine book. So are you in a position to tell me now what specific photographs you're claiming?

tell me now what specific photographs you're claiming?

MR. SERBAGI: Your Honor, there's over 3,000
photographs in that collection. We're not asserting any of

MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR

(914) 390-4027

07cqshaMS

1

23456789

10

22 23

24 25

123456789

10 11 12

13 14

15 16 17

22 23

0

0

them in this case against these parties.

THE COURT: I'm asking you what claims you're making. MR. SERBAGI: What claims are we making? I'm sorry.

I don't understand the question.

THE COURT: Claims as to which photographs -- which particular photographs fall within the scope of your claims? That's what I'm asking you.

MR. SERBAGI: It's a difficult question to answer, your Honor, because the scope of our claim has nothing to do with the photographs that we have in our collection. It has absolutely nothing to do with anything. All we're requesting -- the only claim we have is a request that the Court declare that Marilyn Monroe died a New York domiciliary. That's the only claim we have.

So in a sense, none of them. Because we're not asserting any of the photographs in this case against these clients.

THE COURT: Okay. I think I understand your position. what are you talking about when you say there is a

folder of photographs, Mr. Slotnick?

MR. SLOTNICK: The Shaw witness identified two binders as being those -- as encompassing those documents which have copyright registration certificates for the Marilyn Monroe photographs.

THE COURT: Which Shaw witness? MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR (914) 390-4027

07cqshaMS

10

9

```
07cqshams.txt
                       MR. SLOTNICK:
                                              The 30(b)(6), Melissa Stevens.
 1
2
3
                       THE COURT: And how specifically did she identify
                    What language did she use?
         them?
 4
                       MR. SLOTNICK: I don't have the specific language.
 5
6
7
8
9
         She said that there were two --
                       THE COURT: Doesn't help me.
        MR. SLOTNICK: Okay. She said there were two binders which contained copyright registration certificates. She said there were at least two binders. I asked if those were all of
10
         the Shaw --
11
                       THE COURT: Now, first, you said two binders.
12
         you're saying at least two binders. Look at the deposition
13
         transcript and tell me what she said.
                       MR. SLOTNICK: One moment. THE COURT: Yes. Take your time.
14
15
16
                       (Pause)
        MR. SLOTNICK: Okay. Your Honor, on Page 138,
"Generally speaking, SFA keeps binders of our files. I've seen
a binder with copyright registration-related documents."
Then I asked, "How many?"
She said, "I really don't know."
I said, "More than five?"
She said, "I'll say more than two, definitely."
I said, "Did you view these binders in preparation for today's deposition?
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
         today's deposition?
                                    MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                             12
         07cqshaMS
"Yes, I did."
 1
 234567
                        I requested that she review the files and produce to
         us any other registrations that FSA -- SFA has with respect to Marilyn Monroe as the girl, or any other specific individual
         photographs with Marilyn Monroe.
                       And that's on Pages 138 through 141 of the deposition
         transcript.
 8
                        (Pause)
 9
                       MR. SERBAGI: May I make an additional point, your
10
         Honor?
11
                       THE COURT: I'm going to hear from you in just a
12
13
                       I want to read this.
         moment.
                       MR. SERBAGI: Certainly. I'm sorry.
14
15
                        (Pause)
         THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, please.
MR. SERBAGI: Okay. Your Honor, there's a few points
I'd like to make by way of an analogy.
If this were an infringement case, and they were
16
17
18
<u>19</u>
         arguing that we had infringed Product A, and in their
20
         complaint, they said on information and belief other products
21
22
         infringe, they certainly would not be entitled to discovery on
all the products that we would have in our repertoire. That
kind of argument, it would open up discovery in incredible
23
24
         ways.
25
                       Secondly, your Honor, we are not asserting any of
                                    MARY M. STATÉN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                              13
         07cqshams
 1
```

2 3

4

these photographs in this case. This is not about our photographs. They have absolutely no standing to argue that

these photographs are in the public domain, anyway. The Court has already ruled that they don't have a right of publicity in Marilyn Monroe. And that's going to be the subject of summary

Page 6

```
O7cqshaMs.txt
judgment briefing, your Honor. They have no standing to argue
that these are in the public domain, because the Court has
already ruled they don't any rights to the photographs to begin
with.

So for them to say on information and belief other
photographs are in the public domain, and then to get discovery
on every single photograph we have, which are thousands, would
open up the floodgates, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, they're not talking about
```

open up the floodgates, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, they're not talking about photographs here. What they're talking about is registration certificates. That's different.

MR. SERBAGI: Well, your Honor, it's photographs that are in the public domain, not the registrations. And so what they're trying to --

THE COURT: But the registrations would be at least indicative or at least they would be relevant to the issue of whether the photographs are in the public domain or not, wouldn't they?

MR. SERBAGI: That is true, your Honor. But based on their argument, they would open up the floodgates to things
MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027

O7cqshaMS
they haven't even identified. This is pure fishing. They
can't just say Risoli and Ballantine are in the public domain
and get discovery on everything we have. I mean, that
argument, as I say with the infringement issue, your Honor, if
it were an infringement claim, that would be the same exact
issue. If I were arguing that a pharmaceutical company's Drug
A was -- patent was invalid, and on that argument, on
information and belief, other patents are invalid, I'd get
discovery an all their patents? It's just baseless.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything further?

MR. SLOTNICK: Yes, one thing your Honor

MR. SLOTNICK: Yes, one thing, your Honor.
First of all, they never made a motion to dismiss this claim or to limit it.

Secondly, and most importantly, let me get back to what they are asserting against us, as well. They're asserting that they have certain rights to use the Marilyn Monroe image, and that we have -- we, the Marilyn Monroe estate and LLC -- have no ability to limit, restrict that right. And they are now seeking from us a determination of Marilyn Monroe's domicile to determine the right of publicity.

domicile to determine the right of publicity.

Well, if someone came off the street having no contact whatsoever with the Marilyn Monroe estate, they'd be thrown out of court if they were asked about domicile.

If the Shaw Estate does not own a copyright in a photograph of Marilyn Monroe, they are in the same position as MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR (914) 390-4027

O7cqshaMS anybody off the street. If they want to be voyeurs of Marilyn Monroe's life, you know, we can address that, too. But that's not what this is about. We're in a court of law. They allegedly have some basis for being in this court of law. They originally did sue for copyright infringement. We would like to have some repose when this case is over. The parties really do needs to know --

THE COURT: You're only entitled to discovery on what's left in the case.

MR. SLOTNICK: Your Honor, all we need -- if we see
Page 7

```
07cqshaMS.txt
         the registration certificates, that's going to go a long way, and obviously, at this stage of the game, all the way to
11
12
13
         determining what the rights are of both of the parties.
14
                        THE COURT: All right. Anything further?
                        MR. SERBAGI: One final point, your Honor.
15
16
                        It's absolutely false to say that we are asserting
         that we have rights to these images in this case anymore. That's not the issue. Those were the issues maybe to begin
17
18
         with when we were asserting various claims.
19
                                                                                  Those issues are
20
         out of the case. It has nothing to do with this case
         whatsoever. They've claimed the two images are in the public
21
22
23
24
                       That's all they're entitled to discovery on, your
         domain.
                     This kind of -- this is blatant fishing expedition.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
I think it might be. However, I don't think I have to
MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
         Honor.
                                                                                                               16
         07cqshaMS
 123456789
         get to that in order to decide this issue.
                        It's pretty plain, from the deposition testimony of
         Melissa Stevens, that, in preparation for her deposition, she looked at these binders, and she describes them in detail as
         binders containing registration certificates.
                        Anything that she looked at in preparation for her
         deposition, counsel would be entitled to inspect.

So I'm going to direct that the Melissa Stevens deposition be reconvened tomorrow at 12:00 noon.
10
                        The folders to which she referred in her deposition
11
12
          testimony will be made available to counsel for inspection.
         That doesn't mean copying. That means inspection, and inspection only. Starting at 8:00 a.m. tomorrow morning, and that will be at Mr. Serbagi's office, unless counsel agree to
13
14
15
          do it somewhere else.
16
17
                        (Pause)
          THE COURT: And then that deposition will proceed starting at 12:00 noon. It will proceed for a maximum of four
18
19
          hours, which should be more than sufficient time.
         Now, there is a second issue that was raised here regarding the scope of the 30(b)(6) deposition.

I have to tell you, gentlemen, I'm kind of perplexed in an '05 case why all this is happening within a week or two
20
21
22
23
         of the close of discovery, but I'm not going to get into it.
You're claiming, Mr. Slotnick, that the witness who
24
                                     MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                                17
          07cashams
 1
2
          was produced was not an appropriate 30(b)(6) deposition.
         You're claiming that she only worked for the company for two weeks. Counsel is telling me that she was involved with the company for a long time. This is not a company that is apparently a Fortune 500 company. It's a small operation.
 3456789
         In any event, the rules are pretty clear with reference to 30(b)(6) deposition. You have the transcript.
          Point out to me any place in the transcript where she was
10
11
```

0

12 13 14

15

unable to provide information that was covered by the scope of the 30(b)(6) notice. Does anybody have a copy of the 30(b)(6) notice? MR. SLOTNICK: I'm not sure (unintelligible), your Honor. (Pause)

```
07cqshams.txt
16
                            MR. SERBAGI:
                                                     Your Honor, the greater issue for us,
17
           really, was that she was limited to talking about two books.
          THE COURT: I'm not getting into what you think is the greater issue. I want to see the 30(b)(6) notice. We're way beyond the time we get into these philosophical discussions.
18
19
20
21
                            (Pause)
           MR. SLOTNICK: Your Honor, we don't have a copy, but I'm looking through the transcript now.
22
23
24
                            (Pause)
25
                            THE COURT: Do you have a copy?
                                          MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                                                  18
           07cqshaMS
                            MR. SERBAGI: No, your Honor, I do not.
 1
2
3
                            (Pause)
          THE COURT: Well, gentlemen, without a copy of the 30(b)(6) notice, I'm really not in a position to give you anything on this. So what I would suggest is that you go out and make a phone call and find out if somebody in your offices can messenger a copy up here. If not, we'll reconvene at two o'clock this afternoon, when I'll see the 30(b)(6) notice, when you have a copy for me. Because that's what this is going to
 4
5
6
7
 8
           you have a copy for me. Because that's what this is going to
10
           turn on. I want to see the scope of the notice. Then I want
11
12
13
          to see the transcript. And counsel can point out to me specifically where in the transcript it's indicated that this particular witness, Melissa Stevens, who apparently is the
14
           niece of one of the three principals, did not comply -- was not
15
           prepared to comply with the 30(b)(6) notice.
           The arguments that she only worked there for two weeks don't mean very much to me. That is absolutely not what a 30(b)(6) witness turns on. A 30(b)(6) witness can be anybody,
16
17
18
19
20
           as long as they are properly prepared to provide factual information on the issues which were raised in the notice.

So one of you gentlemen go out in the hall and use the phone if you have to, and see if you can get somebody to get a
21
22
23
           copy of the 30(b)(6) notice up here. And as soon as you get
24
25
           that information, you can let my Clerk know.
Okay. Let's go ahead with the criminal calendar,
                                           MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                                                   19
           07cqshaMS
 1
           please.
  2
3
4
                            MR. SERBAGI: Can I make one point, quick point, with
           your Honor?
           THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SERBAGI: We do have scheduled today the final
30(b)(6) deposition of CMG, just for the Court's information.

Mr. Slotnick, if this is his issue, should have had this here
 5
6
7
8
9
           today.
                            THE COURT: You both got a lot of lawyers working with
10
                      Get somebody else to do one or the other. Right now,
11
           call down there and see if you can get it.
12
13
14
                            What time is that deposition set for?
           MR. SERBAGI: It's set for 10:00, your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, if somebody in your office has a copy and they can fax it up here, I'll permit -- I'll take a fax for that limited purpose, even though I don't usually do
15
16
17
18
           that.
```

19 20 It's incredible to me that you guys would come in here to argue this issue and nobody has a copy of the notice.

In any event, see if you can get it. If you can, the Page 9

Π

21 22 23

24

```
07cqshaMS.txt
           Clerk will give you the fax number, and I'll have it faxed up.
21
22
23
                            Okay. Second call.
                            (Recess)
24
                           THE DEPUTY CLERK: Your Honor, in the matter of the MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
25
                                                          (914) 390-4027
                                                                                                                                 20
           07cqshaMS
           Shaw Family, et al. against CMG Worldwide, et al. second call.
           THE COURT: Okay. I understand from my Clerk that neither of you gentlemen, because of the holiday situation, were able to get anybody in your office who could obtain a copy
  456789
           of the 30(b)(6) deposition. So there is not much I can do
           about that
                            All right. The deposition of -- the renewed
           deposition of Melissa Stevens will take place, as I've
           indicated, tomorrow.
           where did you want to do that?

MR. SLOTNICK: We'll do it at our office.

THE COURT: Okay. The only problem -- the only reason

I'm hesitating -- ordinarily, I'd say that's strictly a matter

within, you know, the purview of you gentlemen -- is that I'm

sure there are going to be further problems. So make sure your

court reporter is prepared to leave your offices and get up

here because if there are any disputes at all. I'm not going
14
15
16
17
           here, because if there are any disputes at all, I'm not going
18
           to do them over the phone. You're going to have to up, and you'll resume your deposition here in the deposition room
19
 20
            downstairs.
                            MR. SLOTNICK: Your Honor, I'm certainly prepared to
 23
            take the deposition here.
                             THE COURT: What do you want to do, Mr. Serbagi?
                            MR. SERBAGI: That's fine with us, your Honor.
 25
                                           MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                                                                                                                                 21
            07cqshaMS
                        THE COURT: All right. Why don't you convene here The boxes -- the only trouble with that is going to be,
 3
4
5
6
7
8
9
            I think the document review should take place -- I think the
            document review should take place at your offices, because that's where the documents would be. And then if there is some
            dispute about the relevancy of the documents, you can call me. Although what I'll tell you is, you're going to bring them up
            here.
           MR. SERBAGI: I'm sorry. When the Court said what do you want to do? I thought you meant if there is a problem. We would prefer to have the deposition in New York, your Honor; and if there is a problem, come up here, but --
THE COURT: All right. That's fine. I have no problem with that. Except I think it ought to be at your office, since you have the documents.
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
                             MR. SERBAGI: That's fine.
 16
            THE COURT: That way, if documents -- you know, if there is some issue about them, the documents are going to be
 17
 18
 <u>ī</u>9
            there and be available.
 20
```

You've only got until December 31st to do all this, and I will not be here on December 31st. So that means

whatever needs to be done is going to be done between now and Friday.

MR. SLOTNICK: Your Honor, just as a logistical issue, you've indicated we can examine the documents, but not copy Page 10

07cqshamS.txt MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR (914) 390-4027

22

```
07cgshams
                                  Obviously, for the purpose of taking the deposition --
               them. Obviously, for the purpose of taking the deposition —
THE COURT: You can make notes on them. And you can mark with a post-it any document you think is relevant to the deposition so that it can be immediately available. But no copying, and you're not going to take anything with you. Okay?

MR. SERBAGI: Just one final request, your Honor, which I made in my letter motion.

The deposition of Anna Strassberg, the parties have consented, because of scheduling difficulties, to take her on January 4th, if that's acceptable to the Court. It's after the discovery deadline.
  1
2
  3
  67
   8
   9
10
                 discovery deadline.
                 THE COURT: Yes, it is. All right. Since both sides have agreed on that, I'll permit that. But that is a so-ordered date, and may not be changed without on order of the Court. The witness is directed to be available and to appear
11
12
13
14
 15
                 on that day.
 16
                                             Anything else?
 17
                                             MR. SLOTNICK: Your Honor, does your Honor want us to
 18
                  come back at two o'clock with respect to the --
THE COURT: No, I don't think it's necessary at this
point. If there are any further issues, I'll deal with them
 19
20
21
                  when the disputes come up. But as far as the claim that the 30(b)(6) witness did not -- was not prepared to testify as appropriate, that claim is gone.

Without the 30(b)(6) notice, I'm not in a position to
 22
 23
 24
 25
                                                                     MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR
(914) 390-4027
                    07cqshaMS
```

23

```
O7cqshaMS
rule on it. So the application is denied.
Okay. Thank you very much.
You will not disappoint me if there are no problems
and you can't come up. Don't get me wrong.
All right. Thank you.
```

MARY M. STATEN, CSR, RPR, RMR (914) 390-4027

 $\Box$